

SUMMARY OF INTERVIEW

Attendees, Date and Type of Interview

The interview was conducted by telephone on February 19, 2009 and attended by Examiner Catherine L. Anderson and Applicant's representatives, Sabing Lee and Gregg Koch.

Exhibits and/or Demonstrations

None.

Identification of Claims Discussed

Claims 1, 5, 6, 14, 24, and 53 were discussed.

Identification of Prior Art Discussed

U.S. Patent Application No. 2003/0108587 ("Orgill"), U.S. Patent Application No. 2003/0050594 ("Zamierowski"), and U.S. Patent Application No. 2003/0014025 ("Allen") were discussed.

Proposed Amendments

In short, and without limitation, Applicant's representatives proposed the following amendments.

- 1) Applicant's representatives proposed amending Claims 1, 5, and 53 to clarify that the first material of the absorbable matrix is different than the second material of the absorbable matrix.
- 2) Applicant's representatives proposed amending Claim 6 to clarify that each of the plurality of protrusions is spaced apart from the other protrusions about an outside surface of the cover.
- 3) Applicant's representatives proposed amending Claim 14 to clarify that the appliance comprises a conduit configured to supply a source of reduced pressure to the space between the cover and the wound, and to clarify that the pressure monitor is supported by the cover and spaced apart or separate from the conduit.
- 4) Applicant's representatives proposed amending Claim 24 to clarify that the temperature monitor is configured to change color when the temperature of the wound falls below normal body temperature so as to provide a visual indication of the temperature of the wound below normal body temperature.

Principal Arguments and Other Matters

In short, and without limitation, Applicant's representatives made the following arguments.

- 1) Applicant's representatives argued that the amended Claims 1, 5, and 53 are not disclosed or suggested by Orgill.
- 2) Applicant's representatives argued that the amended Claim 6 is not disclosed or suggested by Zamierowski.
- 3) Applicant's representatives argued that the amended Claim 14 is not disclosed or suggested by Zamierowski.
- 4) Applicant's representatives argued that the amended Claim 24 is not disclosed, suggested, or rendered obvious by Zamierowski.

Results of Interview

- 1) The Examiner agreed that Claims 1, 5, and 53, amended as proposed, appear to overcome the anticipation rejection based on Orgill.
- 2) The Examiner agreed that Claim 6, amended as proposed, appears to overcome the anticipation rejection based on Zamierowski.
- 3) The Examiner agreed that Claim 14, amended as proposed, appears to cause the claims to overcome the anticipation rejection based on Zamierowski.
- 4) Examiner Anderson stated that she would take the proposed amendments to Claim 24 under consideration, that she could not state a conclusion regarding whether the amendments would overcome the obviousness rejection without further consideration, and that she believed that Allen does not anticipate Claim 24 as amended.